UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,637	07/10/2003	Antonio Nucci	2315/SPRI.104359	3421

32423 7590 10/15/2007
SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY L.P.
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY
KSOPHT0101-Z2100
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100

EXAMINER	
SONI, KETAN S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2619	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/616,637	Applicant(s) NUCCI ET AL.	
	Examiner Ketan Soni	Art Unit 2619	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 August 2007.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-9 and 11-16 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-9 and 11-16 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/11/04, 11/5/03, 10/17/03.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

- Applicant's Amendment filed 08/03/2007 is acknowledged.
- Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, and 14 have been amended.
- Claim 6 has been cancelled in response to double patenting rejection with claim 7 of copending Application No. 10/615649, See MPEP § 822. Hence this statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection overcame by canceling claim: 6.
- Claim 10 has been cancelled in response to rejection based on ***35 USC § 101.***
- This action is made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the Examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the Examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over **Doverspike et al. (U.S. Pub. # 2002/0097671 A1)** in view of **Askew et al. (US Patent # 5182744).**

Consider **claims 1,** Doverspike et al. clearly show and disclose computer storage media having instructions for and a method for identifying optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology of the network (an optical network, organized into a general topology of links and nodes 110, . . . , 190, column: 2, paragraph [0012]), comprising: obtaining one or more mapping options for mapping multiple logical links between one or more pairs of network nodes (A general heuristic is to create some cost metric and select a "minimum weight" path among all suitable paths that minimizes the cost metric and has the required size for the connection request, Column: 5, paragraph [0019]) onto physical paths that are at least relatively disjoint; obtaining a priority order of the network node pairs; (The restoration path is selected from a graph of links in the network which are physically diverse from the service path. For example, in the context of optical networking, the links do not share a common fiber span with the service path, Col. 1, paragraph [0006]; Selecting a service path in response to the communication request, accordingly, may be accomplished by computing a path between the source and destination that minimizes some cost metric and which has the required size for the

connection request. It is assumed that each OXC node has knowledge of the whole optical network topology and the number of free channels on each link as well as some optical link weight function. A known shortest path algorithm such as Dijkstra's shortest path algorithm may be used to compute the minimal weight path through the network, Col. 6, paragraph [0021] and "The process of computation of service path and restoration path for a connection request relies on the information about the availability of optical network resources and the path selection objective. A general heuristic is to create some cost metric and select a "minimum weight" path among all suitable paths that minimizes the cost metric and has the required size for the connection request, Col. 5, paragraph [0019]).

Doverspike et al. discloses the restoration of links, and cost metric but generally silent about how to use a priority order of the network node pairs for the purpose of correlating the mapping options with the priority order of the network nodes to identify optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology of a network.

In the same field of endeavor, Askew et al. clearly show and disclose obtaining a network node priority order, which is derived from network traffic carried between the network node pairs; (The program determines the priorities of various type traffic, and program also determines critical traffic (high priority), private line traffic (second highest priority), and so on, col: 9, lines: 46-50; additionally order of transferring the traffic is based on the priority of the traffic and volume, col: 10, lines: 11-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use priority order of the network nodes, as taught by

Askew, in the method for identifying optimal mapping of logical links to the physical network topology as in Doverspike et al. for the purpose of selecting the optimal logical path that meets a defined time constraint for minimal weight path through the network and average or minimum or maximum time delay for entity delivery, for enhancing reliability of a telecommunication network.

Consider **claim: 2**, and as applied to claim 1, Doverspike et al. clearly show and disclose a media with the method of claim: 1 further comprising obtaining the availability of wavelengths in a network (Weights are computed for the links using an array representing a restoration link capacity - which is expressed as a number of channels/wavelengths in optical networking, Column: 1, paragraph [0006]).

Claims 4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over **Doverspike et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2002/0097671 A1)** in view of **Askew et al. (US Patent # 5182744)** and further in view of **Wolpert (U.S. Patent # 6577601).**

Consider **claim: 4**, and as applied to the method of claim 2, Doverspike et al. in view of Askew et al. do not disclose obtaining a maximum time delay allowed between each pair of network nodes.

However, Wolpert clearly shows and discloses obtaining a maximum time delay and using it to identify the optimal mapping (The objective of the invention is to optimize

some measure of network performance, such as overall entity throughput ...average or minimum or maximum time delay for entity delivery, priority level for an entity, or some other measure of quality of service (QOS) on the network, Column. 3, lines: 52-59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use maximum time delay as the cost metric, as disclosed by Wolpert, in the method for identifying optimal mapping of logical links to the physical network topology as disclosed by Doverspike and Askew for the purpose of selecting the optimal logical path that meets a defined time constraint, and minimum or maximum time delay for entity delivery.

Consider **claim: 5**, and as applied to the method of claim 4, Doverspike et al. in view of Askew et al. is generally silent about the method further comprising: obtaining the relative time delay allowed between two or more physical paths.

However, Wolpert clearly shows and discloses using maximum time delay and relative time delay as cost metrics to identify the optimal mapping (This cost, referenced to a particular i-to-j link, may be the maximum or minimum or average bandwidth available (if the entity is to be transported along that link, and if the entity is expressed in an electronic format), the time delay associated with use of that link, or some other suitable measure of cost of using the particular link, Column. 5, lines 51 –59; The preceding development identifies the i-to-j'(u) link for entity transport, using a maximum difference

of two J(u)-component vectors, Target and Actual, that are determined iteratively, Column. 8, lines: 43 - 46).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use relative time delay and maximum time delay as taught by Wolpert incorporated with the method disclosed by Doverspike et al. for identifying optimal mapping of logical links to the physical network topology and use wavelength availability as cost metrics for the purpose of selecting the optimal logical path for entity transport.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over **Doverspike et al. (U.S. Pub # 2002/0097671 A1)** in view of **Askew et al. (US Patent # 5182744)** and further in view of **Wolpert (U.S. Patent # 6577601).**

Consider **claim: 3,** and as applied to the method of claim 2, Doverspike et al. in view of Askew et al. clearly show and disclose a method for identifying the optimal mapping of logical links using a cost metric to assign a weight to the paths (Doverspike et al. discloses: The process of computation of service path and restoration path for a connection request relies on the information about the availability of optical network resources and the path selection objective. A general heuristic is to create some cost metric and select a "minimum weight" path among all suitable paths that minimizes the cost metric and has the required size for the connection request, Column: 3, paragraph [0019]). Doverspike et al. also disclose that link capacity is expressed as a number of wavelengths in optical networking (Weights are computed for the links using an array

representing a restoration link capacity - which is expressed as a number of channels / wavelengths in optical networking, Column: 1, paragraph [0006]). However Doverspike et al. in view of Askew et al. do not disclose using the maximum time delay and the relative time delay as cost metrics to identify the optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology of a network. In the same field of endeavor, Wolpert clearly shows and discloses using maximum time delay and relative time delay as cost metrics to identify the optimal mapping (This cost, referenced to a particular i-to-j link, may be the maximum or minimum or average bandwidth available, Column: 5, lines 51 –53; the time delay associated with use of that link, or some other suitable measure of cost of using the particular link, column: 5, lines: 51-59; and The preceding development identifies the i-to-j' (u) link for entity transport, using a maximum difference of two J(u)-component vectors, Target and Actual, that are determined iteratively, Column: 8,lines 43 - 46).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use relative time delay and maximum time delay as taught by Wolpert incorporated with the method disclosed by Doverspike et al. for identifying optimal mapping of logical links to the physical network topology and use wavelength availability as cost metrics for the purpose of selecting the optimal logical path for entity transport.

Claims 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over **Doverspike et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 200210097671 A1)** in

view of **Askew et al. (US Patent # 5182744)** and further in view of **Modiano et al. (Survivable Routing of Logical Topologies in WDM Networks)**.

Consider **claim 7**, and as applied to claim 1, Doverspike et al. as modified by Askew et al. generally silent about using an integer linear program to perform the correlation.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Modiano et al. clearly show and disclose using an integer linear program to find the optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology of a network (Section III, Integer Linear Programming Formulation: "Using Theorem I, we are able to formulate the problem of survivable routing of a logical topology on a given physical topology as an Integer Linear Program (ILP).").

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an integer linear program as taught by Modiano et al. in the method for identifying optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology of a network as in Doverspike et al., Wolpert and Askew et al. for the purpose of solving the optimization problem.

Consider **claim 9**, and as applied to claim 1, Doverspike et al. as modified by Askew et al. do not disclose performing the correlation to identify the optimal mapping for a large Internet network backbone.

However, Modiano et al. clearly show and disclose performing the correlation on the NSFNET (111. Integer Linear Programming formulation, paragraph 8: "To illustrate the utility of this approach, implemented the ILP for the NSFNET physical topology ...").

It is notoriously well-known in the art that the NSFNET (Figure: 2) is a large Internet network backbone. Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to perform the correlation to identify the optimal mapping on the NSFNET as taught by Modiano et al. using the method for identifying optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology of a network as in Doverspike et al., Wolpert and Askew et al. for the purpose of solving the optimization problem for a large Internet network backbone.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over **Doverspike et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0097671 A1)** in view of **Askew et al. (US Patent # 5182744)** and further in view of **Nucci et al. ("Design of Fault-Tolerant Logical Topologies in Wavelength-Routed Optical IP Networks").**

Consider **claim: 8,** and as applied claim 1, Doverspike et al. as modified by Askew et al. do not disclose that the correlation is performed using a Tabu search methodology.

However, in the same field of endeavor Nucci et al. clearly show and disclose using a Tabu search methodology to find the optimal mapping of logical links to the. physical topology of a network (Section IV, Tabu Search for the SLTDP: The heuristic we propose to use in the solution of SLTDP relies on the application of the Tabu Search (TS) methodology, and Section II, Problem Statement: The Survivable Logical Topology Design Problem (SLTDP) under a given unicast and multicast traffic pattern can be stated to find a logical topology and a mapping that optimize (maximize or minimize) network function).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a Tabu search methodology as taught by Nucci et al. in the method for identifying optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology of a network as in Doverspike et al., Wolpert and Askew et al. for the purpose of solving the optimization problem.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over **Armitage et al. (Design of a Survivable WDM Photonic Network)** in view of **Askew et al. (US Patent # 5182744).**

Consider **claim: 11**, Armitage et al. clearly show and disclose a computer system for identifying optimal mapping of logical links onto the physical topology of a network, with a practical constraint module comprising a mapping option sub-module for obtaining mapping options and a correlation module coupled with the practical constraint module for correlating the mapping options to identify optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology of the network (Simulation Results: "The DAP Algorithm has been implemented in Mathematica 2.2 for Solaris on a SUN-Sparc computer system 20 workstation. The physical topology used for the tests was the ARPA2 network. The virtual topology has been defined by randomly generating clear-channels to obtain a (at least) bi-connected network with a connectivity of 20%, page 13, section: 3.4; "The Virtual Topology consists of a graph representing all the clear-channels that are present in the network. It is the only view of the network available to the higher layer switches. The Physical Topology is the real network, composed of optical links and photonic nodes. The mapping between these two topologies is

performed by the design algorithm, page 2, Definitions, paragraph 4; The effects of correlated failures of many clear-channels sharing each physical link can be eliminated - or at least minimized - by using the Disjoint Alternate Path (DAP) algorithm ...The DAP algorithm maps the clear-channels onto the physical network in such a way that, for each of them, there exists an alternate path with same end-nodes, but sharing no optical link with the clear-channel to which it is associated, page 7, Design Protection, The Principle, paragraph 2; SPRA means that the shortest route is always used to route a clear-channel on the physical network. In our case, the length of a route is the number of optical links it uses. At each step of the global iteration, a Tabu Search is performed, starting from the initial solution of this step, page 12, paragraphs 4 and 5).

However Armitage et al. is generally silent about disclosing network node priority sub-module for obtaining a network node priority order; which is derived from network traffic carried between the network node pairs.

In the same field of endeavor, Askew et al. clearly show and disclose obtaining a network node priority order, which is derived from network traffic carried between the network node pairs; (The program determines the priorities of various type traffic, and program also determines critical traffic (high priority), private line traffic (second highest priority), and so on, col: 9, lines: 46-50; additionally order of transferring the traffic is based on the priority of the traffic and volume, col: 10, lines: 11-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use priority order of the network nodes, as taught by Askew, in the method for identifying optimal mapping of logical links to the physical

network topology as in Doverspike et al. for the purpose of selecting the optimal logical path that meets a defined time constraint for minimal weight path through the network and average or minimum or maximum time delay for entity delivery, for enhancing reliability of a telecommunication network.

Claims 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over **Armitage et al. ("Design of a Survivable WDM Photonic Network ")**, and as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of **Askew et al. (US Patent # 5182744)** and further in view of **Doverspike et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0097671 A1)**.

Consider **claim: 12**, and as applied to claim 11, Armitage et al. in view of Askew et al. do not disclose a wavelength sub-module. However, Doverspike et al. clearly show and disclose a wavelength module for obtaining the availability of wavelengths in the network (as shown in Fig. 1, optical mesh network 100 comprises optical cross-connects (OXCs) and optical transport systems (OTSs), Fig. 1 and Column. 2, paragraph [0013]; The optical transport systems in Fig. 1 comprise pairs of bidirectional Wavelength Division Multiplexer (WDM) terminals. The WDM terminals multiplex optical signals at different wavelengths into a single optical fiber for each direction of transmission; Weights are computed for the links using an array representing a restoration link capacity - which is expressed as a number of channels/wavelengths in optical networking, Column. 1, paragraph [0006]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the module for obtaining the availability of

wavelengths in a network as taught by Doverspike et al. in the computer system of Armitage et al. in view of Askew et al. for the purpose of using wavelength availability as a criteria in identifying the optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology of the network.

Consider **claim: 13,** and as applied to claim 12, Armitage et al. as modified by Askew et al. and Doverspike et al. clearly show and disclose a computer system wherein the correlation module correlates the mapping options with the network node priority and wavelength availability (Simulation Results: the DAP Algorithm has been implemented in Mathematica 2.2 for Solaris on a Sparc 20 workstation, page 13; "SPRA means that the shortest route is always used to route a clear-channel on the physical network. In our case, the length of a route is the number of optical links it uses. At each step of the global iteration, a Tabu Search is performed, starting from the initial solution of this step, page 12, paragraphs 4 and 5; Our future work will be oriented towards the introduction of maximal capacity for the optical links and nodes (i.e. having a maximum number of channels per fiber, page 16, Conclusion, paragraph 7).

Claims 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over **Doverspike et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2002/0097671 A1)** in view of **Askew et al. (US Patent # 5182744).**

Consider **claim: 14,** Doverspike et al. clearly show and disclose a system for identifying optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology of the network, the system comprising: means for obtaining one or more mapping options for mapping multiple logical links between one or more pairs of network nodes onto physical paths

that are at least relatively disjoint and means for identifying the optimal mapping using a cost metric to assign a weight to the paths (Fig. 1 is a mesh network 100, illustratively an optical network, organized into a general topology of links and nodes, Fig. 1 and Column. 1, paragraph [0012]; with reference to Fig. 1, optical mesh network 100 comprises optical cross-connects (OXCs) and optical transport systems (OTSs), Column. 2, paragraph [0013]; The restoration path is selected from a graph of links in the network which are physically diverse from the service path. For example, in the context of optical networking, the links do not share a common fiber span with the service path, Column. 1, paragraph [0006]; Selecting a service path in response to the communication request, accordingly, may be accomplished by computing a path between the source and destination that minimizes some cost metric and which has the required size for the connection request. It is assumed that each OXC node has knowledge of the whole optical network topology and the number of free channels on each link as well as some optical link weight function. A known shortest path algorithm such as Dijkstra's shortest path algorithm may be used to compute the minimal weight path through the network, Column. 3, paragraph [0021]; the process of computation of service path and restoration path for a connection request relies on the information about the availability of optical network resources and the path selection objective. A general heuristic is to create some cost metric and select a "minimum weight" path among all suitable paths that minimizes the cost metric and has the required size for the connection request, Column. 3, paragraph [0019]).

However Doverspike et al. is generally silent about obtaining network node priority order; which is utilizing from network traffic carried between the network node pairs.

In the same field of endeavor, Askew et al. clearly show and disclose obtaining a network node priority order, which is derived from network traffic carried between the network node pairs; (The program determines the priorities of various type traffic, and program also determines critical traffic (high priority), private line traffic (second highest priority), and so on, col: 9, lines: 46-50; additionally order of transferring the traffic is based on the priority of the traffic and volume, col: 10, lines: 11-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use priority order of the network nodes, as taught by Askew, in the method for identifying optimal mapping of logical links to the physical network topology as in Doverspike et al. for the purpose of selecting the optimal logical path that meets a defined time constraint for minimal weight path through the network and average or minimum or maximum time delay for entity delivery, for enhancing reliability of a telecommunication network.

Consider **claim: 15**, and as applied to claim 14, Doverspike et al. as modified by Askew et al. clearly show and disclose means for obtaining the availability of wavelengths in the network (Doverspike: With reference to Fig. 1, optical mesh network 100 comprises optical cross-connects (OXCs) and optical transport systems (OTSs), Fig. 1 and Column: 3, paragraph [0013]; The optical transport systems in Fig. 1

comprise pairs of bidirectional Wavelength Division Multiplexer (WDM) terminals ... The WDM terminals multiplex optical signals at different wavelengths into a single optical fiber for each direction of transmission, Column: 3, paragraph [0013]; Wavelength: Weights are computed for the links using an array representing a restoration link capacity - which is expressed as a number of channels/wavelengths in optical networking, Column. 1, paragraph [0006]).

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over **Doverspike et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2002/0097671 A1)** in view of **Askew et al. (US Patent # 5182744)** and further in view of **Wolpert (U.S. Patent # 6577601).**

Consider **claim: 16**, and as applied to claim 15, Doverspike et al. as modified by Askew et al clearly show and disclose means for identifying the optimal mapping of logical links using a cost metric to assign a weight to the paths (Fig. 1 is a mesh network 100, illustratively an optical network, organized into a general topology of links and nodes, Fig. 1 and Column. 1, paragraph [0012]; With reference to Fig. 1, optical mesh network 100 comprises optical cross-connects (OXCs) and optical transport systems (OTSs), Column. 2, paragraph [0013]; The process of computation of service path and restoration path for a connection request relies on the information about the availability of optical network resources and the path selection objective. A general heuristic is to create some cost metric and select a "minimum weight" path among all suitable paths that minimizes the cost metric and has the required size for the connection request, and Column. 3, paragraph [0019]) and wavelength availability (Weights are computed for the

links using an array representing a restoration link capacity--which is expressed as a number of channels/wavelengths in optical networking, column: 2, paragraph [0006]), except the method which further comprising: correlating the mapping options with maximum time delay, the relative time delay, the wavelength availability and the priority order of the network node pairs to identify optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology of a network.

However Doverspike et al. as modified by Askew et al. is generally silent about using maximum time delay and relative time delay, the wavelength availability and the priority order of the network node pairs to identify optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology of a network.

In the same field of endeavor, Wolpert clearly shows and discloses using maximum time delay and relative time delay, the wavelength availability and the priority order of the network node pairs to identify optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology of a network (This cost, referenced to a particular i-to-j link, may be the maximum or minimum or average bandwidth available, Column: 5, lines 51 –53; the time delay associated with use of that link, or some other suitable measure of cost of using the particular link, column: 5, lines: 51-59; and The preceding development identifies the i-to-j' (u) link for entity transport, using a maximum difference of two J(u)-component vectors, Target and Actual, that are determined iteratively, Column: 8,lines 43 – 46) and the priority order (priority level of an entity) of the network node pairs to identify optimal mapping of logical links to the physical topology (for wavelength availability) of a network ((priority level or priority order) The objective of the invention is

to optimize some measure of network performance, such as overall entity throughput, average or minimum or maximum time delay for entity delivery, priority level for an entity, or some other measure of quality of service (QOS) on the network, column. 3, lines 52-59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use maximum time delay, relative time delay, wavelength availability and network node priority order as cost metrics in the method for identifying optimal mapping of logical links to the physical network topology as in Doverspike et al., Wolpert and Askew et al. for the purpose of selecting the logical path that meets defined time constraints and the optimal logical path.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on August 03, 2007 with respect to claims: 1-5, 7, 8, 9, 11-16 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

- Karmarkar (U.S. Patent/PG PUB # 4744028) discloses: Methods and apparatus for efficient resources allocation.
- Tate et al. (U.S. Patent/PG PUB # 5933607) discloses: Digital Communication system for simultaneous transmission of data from constant and variable rate source.
- Holender et al. (U.S. Patent/PG PUB # 6069894) discloses: Enhancement of network operation and performance.
- Bertin et al. (U.S. Patent/PG PUB # 5600638) discloses: Improving path selection in a high-speed packet switching network.
- Nusekabel et al. (U.S. Patent # US 6229791 B1) discloses: Method and System for providing partitioning of partially switched network.
- Albanese et al. (U.S. Patent # 7139834 B1) discloses: Data routing monitoring and management.
- Alanyali et al. (U.S. Patent # 6304349 B1) discloses: WDM optical communications network and methods for provisioning.
- Wang (U.S. Patent # 5500808) discloses: Timing information predicting method for mapped and optimized logic network - by generating device for simulating delay time associated with mapped logic network corresponding to logic node in unmapped logic network.

Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to** (571) 273-8300 **or mailed to**:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ketan Soni whose telephone number is (571) 270-1782. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30am to 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Vu, Huy D. can be reached on 571-272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028. If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Ketan Soni

ks

Oct 10, 2007.

HUY D. VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600